

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-27 and 29-33 are currently pending in the instant application and are subject to the following new lack of unity requirement. Claim 28 was canceled by preliminary amendment.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Claims 1-27 and 29-33 are drawn to more than one inventive concept (as defined in PCT Rule 13), and accordingly, a restriction is required according to the provision of PCT Rule 13.2

PCT Rule 13.2 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a general inventive concept (requirement of unity of invention).

PCT Rule 13.2 states that unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features *that makes a contribution over the prior art*.

Group I: Claims 1-17 and 30 drawn to method of using a compound of formula (I), classified in various subclasses of classes 514, 540, 544, 546 and 548. If this group is elected, applicants are requested to elect a single species for search purposes. For example, a compound of formula (I), wherein R1 and R2 are hydrogen.

Group II: Claims 18-27, 29, 31-33 drawn to compounds of formula (III) and a process of making the compound of claim 18, classified in various subclasses of classes 514, 546 and 548.

Art Unit: 1626

If this group is elected, applicants are requested to elect a single species for search purposes. For example, a compound of formula (III), wherein R1, R3', R4', R5' are hydrogen.

In the instant case, upon election of a single compound, the Office will review the claims and disclosure to determine the scope of the independent invention encompassing the elected compound (compounds which are so similar thereto as to be within the same inventive concept and reduction to practice). The scope of an independent invention will encompass all compounds within the scope of the claim, which fall into the same class and subclass as the elected compound, but may also include additional compounds, which fall in related subclasses. Examination will then proceed on the elected compound AND the entire scope of the invention encompassing the elected compound as defined by common classification. A clear statement of the examined invention, defined by those class(es) and subclass(es) will be set forth in the first action on the merits. Note that the restriction requirement will not be made final until such time as applicant is informed of the full scope of compounds along with (if appropriate) the process of using or making said compound under examination.

The claims herein lack unity of invention under PCT rule 13.1 and 13.2 since, under 37 CFR 1.475(a) the compounds defined in the claims lack a significant structural element qualifying as the special technical feature that defines a contribution over the prior art. The technical feature of the instant claim(s) is pyrazolidinedione ring, which does not make a contribution over the prior art (as can be seen by Shirasishi et al., U.S. Pat. Num. 5,089,516, formula of Claim 1, column 32, teaches 1-phenyl-3,5-pyrazolidinedione derivatives), which corresponds to applicant's instantly claimed feature.

Art Unit: 1626

Accordingly, unity of invention is considered to be lacking and restriction of the invention in accordance with the rules of unity of invention is considered to be proper.

Additionally, the vastness of the claimed subject matter, and the complications in understanding the claimed subject matter imposes a serious burden on any examination of the claimed subject matter.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1626

In addition, because of the plethora of classes and subclasses in each of the Inventions, a serious burden is imposed on the examiner to perform a complete search of the defined areas. Therefore, because of the reasons given above, the restriction set forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

Advisory of Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double

Art Unit: 1626

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Charles Miller on 2/12/2009 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susannah Chung whose telephone number is (571) 272-6098. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Golam M. M. Shameem/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626

Susannah Chung, 2/16/2009

Application/Control Number: 10/562,623

Page 7

Art Unit: 1626